



PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS IN EAST KHASI HILLS DISTRICT OF MEGHALAYA, INDIA

Dr. Ashok Kumar Erigala¹ and Laurence Kharluni²

¹Assistant Professor, Dept. of Education, NEHU, Shillong.

²Research Scholar, Dept. of Education, NEHU, Shillong.



ABSTRACT :

Willingness to help others is an essential attitude by which one can lead effective social life. The term 'pro-social' relates to behaviour which is positive and intended to benefit other individuals. It is an 'intentional voluntary behaviour intended to benefit another' (Eisenberg, 1990). The study tries to compare the pro-social behaviour with respect to demographic variables i.e., sex, locality and type of school management and to find out whether there is a relationship between pro-social behaviour and academic achievement of higher secondary students of East Khasi Hills District. There is significant difference between male and female, between urban and rural and government, government aided and private higher secondary students with regard to pro-social behaviour. There is also a significant correlation between pro-social behaviour and academic achievement of higher secondary students. So, academic achievement increases when students act pro-socially.

KEYWORDS : Pro-social Behaviour, Academic Achievement, Higher Secondary students

INTRODUCTION

The aim of education is to train a child to become a better person in the society. This could be done only by imbuing in him/her the spirit of helping his neighbours and other children in the school and family. Pro-social behaviour is seen as voluntary behaviour intended to help or benefit another (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Lai, Siu & Shek, 2015; Albert & Thilagavathy, 2013) which includes activities such as helping, comforting, sharing, and cooperating (Batson et. al, 2003); rescuing (Albert & Thilagavathy, 2013) donating, and volunteering, following rules in a game, being honest and cooperating with others in social situations (Afolabi, 2014), sharing resources, providing assistance and protecting someone from harm (Spivak, Lipsey, Farran, & Polanin, 2014). It also includes actions like providing leadership, expressing empathy, providing verbal support and general friendliness or kindness (Dalton, 2010).

Attention to pro-social behaviour in psychology originated with McDougall (1908), who argued that pro-social behaviour is the result of "tender emotions" created by the parental instinct, but most current research has its roots in lay and scientific reactions to the nonresponsive bystanders in the brutal murder of Katherine "Kitty" Genovese in 1964 (Penner, Fritzsche, Craiger, & Freifeld, 1995).

Pro-social behaviour can be determined by past behaviour, moral judgement and socio-demographic variables like age, sex, income and educational level etc. It could also be influenced by parents, family members, peer, friends, school and elders. Among all these, parental influence is the most important predictor, followed by peer and then school influence (Lai, Siu & Shek, 2015).

COMPONENTS OF PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

There are eight components of pro-social behaviour. They are *social responsibility* – an obligation or duty to act in a manner that benefits society (Carlo & Randall, 2002); *emphatic concern* – ability to understand another person's feelings, experiences etc.; *perspective taking* is the ability to perceive a situation from someone else's point of view (Kakavoulis, 1998); *moral reasoning* – aspect of children's moral development concerned with knowledge and understanding of moral issues and principles (Kakavoulis, 1998); *Altruism* – the fact of caring about the need and happiness of other people more than one's own; *reciprocity* is the act of giving benefits to another in return for benefits received. (Molm, Schaefer and Collett, 2007). *Equity* – the state of being just and fair with more focus on the deprived sections of the society/community/caste/tribe, etc. and *self-sacrifice* – sacrifice of one's personal interests or well being for the sake of others or for a cause. It is the giving up of one's own interests or wishes in order to help others.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Albert & Thilagavathy (2013) found that the level of pro-social behaviour of higher secondary students is average and rural and urban higher secondary students do not differ significantly in their mean pro-social behaviour. Some studies found that male and female students do not differ in pro-social behaviors (Kavussanu, Stamp, Slade & Ring, 2009; Albert & Thilagavathy, 2013) but other studies found that male students engaged in more anti-social acts than female students (Kavussanu, Stamp, Slade & Ring, 2009; Kakavoulis, 1998; Olthof, 2012). One study claimed that helping behavior disappeared from today's adolescent youth (Lukacikova, 2011).

Sex differences seemed to be in both the total percentage of aggressive behavior and the particular kind of aggressiveness (Kakavoulis, 1998). It was found that social context plays an important role in pro-social and moral development (Carlo, Fabes, Laible & Kupanoff, 1999). King et. al. (2005) found that there was little evidence that children with chronic conditions were at direct risk for poorer outcomes and recreational participation and behavioural functioning were the main predictors of pro-social behaviour. It was also found that task orientation negatively predicted anti-social behavior, while ego orientation negatively predicted pro-social behaviour (Kavussanu, 2006). Jo-Ann Tsang (2006) found that participants receiving a favour helped more and reported more gratitude compared to participants in the chance condition. Sage & Kavussanu (2008) found that in general, players "sometimes" to "often" engaged in pro-social behavior and "rarely" to "sometimes" engaged in anti-social behavior.

Lukacikova (2011) concluded that the family a child comes does not affect his/her behaviour to help and about a quarter of respondents would help a person in need, even though they are in a hurry. Parveen (1995) discovered that altruism is significantly affected by the degree of religiosity and there is significant relationship between religiosity and Altruism. Verma (1997) concluded that there is increase in average pro-social scores with advances in age and Twenge, Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco and Bartels (2007) found that social exclusion caused a substantial reduction in pro-social behaviour.

NEED OF THE STUDY

Pro-social behaviour is a positive behaviour through which a person does positive actions such as helping, comforting, sharing, and cooperating intentionally to benefit other individuals. Social life will be much benefitted by the pro-social behaviour of its members. But in the present day context, people shy away from helping one another (Lukacikova, 2011) because they feel that the other people are not their brothers, sisters, parents or relation. The spirit of helping and co-operating is diminishing day by day. There are times that the life of people is in danger and need immediate action. Unless the people have this spirit of pro-social behaviour, they would not lend their helping hand to others.

The role of education is vital in imbibing the pro-social behaviour among the children to make them future responsible citizens of the society. When students perform pro-social acts, they will feel contented and satisfied and that will enhance their academic achievement as well. From the review of related

literature, it was found that a few studies had been conducted on pro-social behaviour abroad and in India. However there was no study found on pro-social behaviour in relation to academic achievement in East Khasi Hills. Therefore, there is a need to study these variables and their relationship to each other in order to create better educational environment for the students, teachers and the educational institutions.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- i) To find out the levels of pro-social behaviour of higher secondary students in East Khasi Hills District of Meghalaya.
- ii) To compare the pro-social behaviour of students with respect to demographic variables i.e., sex, locality and type of school management.
- iii) To find out the relationship between pro-social behaviour and academic achievement of higher secondary students in East Khasi Hills District.

NULL HYPOTHESES

The proposed study will test the following hypotheses.

1. There is no significant difference in pro-social behaviour of higher secondary students of East Khasi Hills District with respect to gender, locality and type of school.
2. There is no significant relationship between pro-social behaviour and academic achievement of higher secondary students in East Khasi Hills District.

METHODOLOGY:

Descriptive method is being used for the study. The sample of the study is 1025 (498 boys and 527 girls) from 41 schools of East Khasi Hills District which are managed by the government, government aided and private individuals.

TOOL:

The tool used in the study is Pro-social Behaviour Scale (PSBS) constructed by the investigator for higher secondary students. It is a five point rating scale where the rating starts from 1 to 5. Its validity is certified by educational experts who gave a favourable opinion to the scale. The reliability of the scale is high since Cronbach's Alpha is .890, Guttman Split-Half Coefficient is .865 and Spearman-Brown Coefficient is .867. With regards to academic achievement, the marks of the final examination are being taken into consideration for the study.

The statistical techniques used in the study are percentage, mean, standard deviation (SD), 't' test to find out the significant differences and Pearson 'r' to find the relationship.

DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY:

The present study has been delimited to class XII students of higher secondary schools of East Khasi Hills District of Meghalaya only. But for the purpose of academic achievement the marks will be collected from previous promotion examination i.e. class XI.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Levels of Pro-social Behaviour of Higher Secondary Students in East Khasi Hills District: The level of overall pro-social behaviour of higher secondary students of East Khasi Hills is calculated and shown in the table below.

Table 1: Levels of PSB of Higher Secondary School Students of East Khasi Hills District.

Range of z scores	Frequency	Percent	Level
+1.8 and above	31	3.0	Very High
+.6 to +1.8	290	28.3	High

-.6 to +.6	407	39.7	Average
-1.8 to -.6	263	25.7	Low
-1.8 and below	34	3.3	Very Low
Total	1025	100	

From table 1, it is observed that 39.7% of the higher secondary students have an average pro-social behaviour, 28.3% have high pro-social behaviour, 25.7% have low pro-social behaviour, 3.3% have very low pro-social behaviour and 3.0% have very high pro-social behaviour.

Analysis and Interpretation of Pro-social Behaviour with Respect to Sex: The mean difference between male and female higher secondary students regarding the different components and overall pro-social behaviour is given in table 2.

Table 2: The Mean Difference between Male and Female Students regarding Pro-social Behaviour and its Components

Variable/Dimension	sex	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Table Value	Remarks
A – Social Responsibility	M	498	30.99	4.126	1023	2.415*	1.96	Significant
	F	527	31.58	3.782				
B – Empathy	M	498	28.89	4.437	1023	4.201**	1.96	Significant
	F	527	30.07	4.581				
C – Perspective Taking	M	498	28.23	3.811	1023	2.672**	1.96	Significant
	F	527	28.88	3.941				
D – Moral Obligation	M	498	29.88	4.511	1023	2.267*	1.96	Significant
	F	527	30.51	4.481				
E – Altruism	M	498	28.84	4.283	1023	3.838**	1.96	Significant
	F	527	29.88	4.379				
F – Reciprocity	M	498	29.46	4.327	1023	1.618	1.96	Not significant
	F	527	29.89	4.189				
G – Equity	M	498	29.82	5.138	1023	1.962*	1.96	Significant
	F	527	30.45	5.082				
H – Self-Sacrifice	M	498	28.26	4.185	1023	2.994**	1.96	Significant
	F	527	29.04	4.102				
Pro-social Behaviour	M	498	234.18	24.045	1023	3.881**	1.96	Significant
	F	527	240.01	24.049				

As it is observed in table 2, the 't' value is higher than the table value in total pro-social behaviour and its components (B) empathy, (C) prospective thinking, (E) altruism, and (H) self-sacrifice, (A) social responsibility, (D) moral obligation and (G) Equity components which is significant. Only one component i.e., (F) reciprocity the 't' value is not significant.

Analysis and Interpretation of Pro-social Behaviour with Respect to Locality: The mean difference between urban and rural higher secondary students regarding the different components and overall pro-social behaviour is given in table 3.

Table 3: The Mean Difference between Urban and Rural Students regarding PSB and its Components

Variable/Components	Locality	N	Mean	SD	df	t value	Table Value	Interpretation
A – Social Responsibility	U	351	31.63	3.840	1023	1.939	1.96	Not significant
	R	674	31.12	4.016				
B – Empathy	U	351	30.28	4.314	1023	3.990**	1.96	Significant

	R	674	29.09	4.617				
C – Perspective Taking	U	351	29.28	4.003	1023	4.301**	1.96	Significant
	R	674	28.19	3.779				
D – Moral Obligation	U	351	31.32	4.318	1023	5.831**	1.96	Significant
	R	674	29.62	4.493				
E – Altruism	U	351	30.22	4.081	1023	4.522**	1.96	Significant
	R	674	28.93	4.440				
F – Reciprocity	U	351	30.55	4.225	1023	4.784**	1.96	Significant
	R	674	29.22	4.210				
G – Equity	U	351	31.43	4.857	1023	5.919**	1.96	Significant
	R	674	29.47	5.123				
H – Self-Sacrifice	U	351	29.00	4.107	1023	1.910	1.96	Not significant
	R	674	28.48	4.177				
Pro-social Behaviour	U	351	243.39	23.666	1023	6.032**	1.96	Significant
	R	674	233.94	23.875				

The results shown in table 3, reveal that the ‘t’ value of total pro-social behaviour and its components (B) empathy (C) perspective taking (D) moral obligation (E) altruism (F) reciprocity and (G) equity is higher than the table value which is significant. The t-value of (A) responsibility and (H) self-sacrifice components is not significant since it is lower than the table value.

Analysis and Interpretation of Pro-social Behaviour with Respect to Type of School: ANOVA (one way) is performed in order to find out the significant difference among government, government aided and private higher secondary school students regarding their pro-social behaviour. The results are shown in the table below.

Table 4: ANOVA Results of PSB of Higher Secondary School Students on the Basis of Type of School Management.

Dimension	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P Value	Interpretation
A – Social Responsibility	Between Groups	9.848	2	4.924	.313	.731	Not significant
	Within Groups	16065.172	1022	15.719			
B – Empathy	Between Groups	348.747	2	174.374	8.553**	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	20835.491	1022	20.387			
C – Perspective Taking	Between Groups	597.347	2	298.674	20.488**	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	14898.717	1022	14.578			
D – Moral Obligation	Between Groups	81.820	2	40.910	2.020	.133	Not significant
	Within Groups	20699.971	1022	20.254			
E – Altruism	Between Groups	942.171	2	471.085	25.971**	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	18537.718	1022	18.139			
F – Reciprocity	Between Groups	182.147	2	91.073	5.059**	.007	Significant
	Within Groups	18397.965	1022	18.002			
G – Equity	Between Groups	959.002	2	479.501	18.958**	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	25848.916	1022	25.292			
H – Self-sacrifice	Between Groups	1.045	2	.523	.030	.970	Not significant
	Within Groups	17709.124	1022	17.328			
Pro-social Behaviour	Between Groups	16651.893	2	8325.947	14.580**	.000	Significant
	Within Groups	583602.497	1022	571.040			

	Total	600254.390	1024			
--	-------	------------	------	--	--	--

From table 4, the p-value is significant in total pro-social behaviour and its components (B) empathy, (C) perspective taking, (E) altruism, (F) reciprocity and (G) equity. With regards to components (A) social responsibility, (D) moral obligation and (H) self-sacrifice the p-value is not significant.

For further analysis the Post Hoc Multiple Comparison has been done and the finding is given in table 5.

Table 5: The Multiple Comparisons of Means of PSB of Higher Secondary Students based on Type of School.

Dependent Variable	(I) Type of School	(J) Type of School	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
B – Empathy	Government	Govt-Aided	1.630**	.413	.000
	Government	Private	1.464**	.399	.001
C – Perspective Taking	Government	Govt-Aided	2.237**	.350	.000
	Government	Private	1.481**	.338	.000
	Private	Govt-Aided	.755*	.264	.017
E – Altruism	Government	Govt-Aided	2.783**	.390	.000
	Government	Private	1.633**	.377	.000
	Private	Govt-Aided	1.150**	.294	.001
F – Reciprocity	Government	Govt-Aided	1.189**	.388	.009
	Government	Private	1.041*	.375	.022
G – Equity	Government	Govt-Aided	2.795**	.460	.000
	Government	Private	2.232**	.445	.000
Pro-social Behaviour	Government	Govt-Aided	11.715**	2.188	.000
	Government	Private	9.029**	2.113	.000

As reflected in the above multiple comparisons table, there is significant difference between government and government aided higher secondary school students in total pro-social behaviour as well as in its five components viz., (B) empathy (C), perspective taking, (E) altruism, (F) reciprocity and (G) equity. The mean difference is in favour of government students. Again, there is significant difference between government and private higher secondary students in total pro-social behaviour as well as in (B) empathy, (C) perspective taking, (E) altruism, (G) equity and (F) reciprocity. And the mean difference is again in favour of government students. Further, there is significant difference between government aided and private higher secondary students in two components i.e., (C) perspective taking and (E) altruism. And the mean difference is in favour of private higher secondary school students.

Relationship between Pro-social Behaviour and Academic Achievement

The correlation between pro-social behaviour and academic achievement is given below.

Table 6: Correlation between Pro-social Behaviour and Academic Achievement

Variable	'r'	p-value	Interpretation
Pro-social Behaviour	.266**	.000	Significant
Academic Achievement			

From table 6 it is observed that the r-value is .266 and p-value is .000. It is significant. Therefore, there is significant relationship between pro-social behaviour and academic achievement of higher secondary students of East Khasi Hills District.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. The study found that majority of the higher secondary students (71%) in East Khasi Hills have average and above average pro-social behaviour. Only 29% of the students are below average level. This high percentage of students in the average and above average level is due to the fact that the students (boys and girls) were very friendly and ever ready to cooperate and help the teachers and other students.
2. It was found that there is significant difference between male and female students of higher secondary students with respect to pro-social behaviour and its components - empathy, prospective thinking, altruism, self-sacrifice, social responsibility, moral obligation and equity. The mean score is found in favour of female students. Female students by their very nature express their emotions more freely than male students. They are the first one to show sympathy when someone is injured or sick. They have great empathy, want to reduce suffering, ready to sacrifice their interest and wish to maintain high morals. So, it is not surprising that female students have higher mean in pro-social behaviour.
3. There is a significant difference between urban and rural higher secondary students of East Khasi Hills District with respect to pro-social behaviour and its components - empathy, perspective taking, moral obligation, altruism, reciprocity and equity components of pro-social behaviour and the mean difference is in favour of urban students. The possible reason for the mean difference is the impact of disaster management classes, mock drills to help in times of calamities and moral classes which is more prevalent in urban schools. However, no significant difference between urban and rural students is found with respect to social responsibility and self-sacrifice components.
4. There is significant difference between government, government aided and private school students with regard to pro-social behaviour and its components – empathy, perspective taking, altruism, reciprocity and equity. The mean difference is in favour of government students. The students of government higher secondary schools were divided into small sections and feel very close to one another. They were ready to share their notes, help their friends physically and academically. However, there is no significant difference between government, government aided and private school students with regard to social responsibility, moral obligation and self-sacrifice components of pro-social behaviour.
5. There is significant relationship between pro-social behaviour and academic achievement of higher secondary students of East Khasi Hills District. The relationship though low is positive and significant. This means that when students perform more pro-social behaviour, they will do better in their academic achievement as well.

CONCLUSION

The study reveals that there is pro-social behaviour in varying levels in higher secondary students of East Khasi Hills District. Female, urban and government students have significantly higher pro-social behaviour than male, rural and government aided and private students respectively. There is also significant relationship between pro-social behaviour and academic achievement of higher secondary students of East Khasi Hills District. This means that when pro-social behaviour is high, academic achievement too increases. Therefore, pro-social behaviour should be encouraged in the schools so that students, teachers and parents may benefit from it.

REFERENCES

- Afolabi, O. A. (2014). Psychosocial predictors of prosocial Behaviour among a sample of Nigerian Undergraduates. *European Scientific Journal* vol.10, No.2 ISSN: 1857 – 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857-7431.

- Ajzen, I. (2002). The theory of planned behaviour: Reactions and reflections. *Psychology and Health*, vol. 26, no 9, 1113-1127
- Albert, A. P. & Thilagavathy, T. (2013). A Study on Pro-Social Behaviour and Parental Behaviour of Higher Secondary Students, *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 2(11) 2319-7064, retrieved from <https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v2i11/MDIwMTM0Njk=.pdf>
- Batson C.D, Lishner D.A, Carpenter A, Dulin L, Harjusloa-Webb S, Stocks EL, Sampat B. (2003) "As you would have them do unto you": Does imagining yourself in the other's place stimulate moral action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2003; 29:1190–1201. [PubMed: 15189613]
- Carlo, G. & Randall, B. A., (2002). The Development of a Measure of Prosocial Behaviors for Late Adolescents. *Faculty Publications, Department of Psychology*. Paper 70. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/psychfacpub/70>
- Carlo, G., Fabes, R. A., Laible, D. & Kupanoff, K. (1999). Early Adolescence and Pro-social/ Moral Behaviour II: The Role of Social and Contextual Influences, *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 19(2), 133-147. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1043&context=psychfacpub>
- Center, D. B. & Kemp D. E. (2002). Antisocial Behaviour in Children and Eysenck's Theory of Personality: An Evaluation, *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 49(4). Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/1034912022000028330>
- Chadha, N. K. & Ganeshan, U. (2015). *Manual for Social Intelligence Scale (SIS-CG)*. Agra: National Psychological Corporation.
- Dalton, B. W. (2010). Antisocial and Prosocial Behavior, (2010). *Noncognitive Skills in the Classroom: New Perspectives on Educational Research*. RTI Press publication No. BK-0004-1009. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International. Retrieved from <http://www.rti.org/rtipress>.
- Eisenberg, N. (1990). Prosocial Development in Early and Mid-Adolescence. In R. Montemayor, G. Adams, & T. Gullota (Eds.), *From Childhood to Adolescence: A transitional Period?* Newbury park, CA: Sage.
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). Prosocial development. *Consistency and Development of Prosocial Dispositions* 1371 In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), W. Damon (Series Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., pp. 701-778). New York: Wiley.
- Johnston, M. and Tobias K. (2011). Moral Self and Moral Emotion Expectancies as Predictors of Anti- and Pro-social Behaviour in Adolescence: A Case for Mediation?, *European Journal Of Developmental Psychology*, 8(2), 228–243. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/17405621003619945>
- Kakavoulis, A. (1998). Aggressive and Pro-social Behaviour in Young Greek Children, *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 6(3). Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/0966976980060308>
- Kavussanu, M. (2006). Motivational predictors of prosocial and antisocial behaviour in football, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24:06, 575-588, DOI: 10.1080/02640410500190825
- Kavussanu, M., Stamp, R., Slade, G. & Ring, C. (2009). Observed Pro-social and Antisocial Behaviours in Male and Female Soccer Players, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 21(1). 62–76. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10413200802624292>
- Lai F.H.Y., Siu A.M.H. & Shek D.T.L. (2015). Individual and social predictors of prosocial behavior among Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong. *Frontier in Pediatrics*. 3:39. doi: 10.3389/fped.2015.00039
- Lukacikova M. (2011). Pro-social Behaviour of Adolescent in School and after-School Environment, *School and Health* 21, *Education and Health Care*. Retrieved from http://www.ped.muni.cz/z21/knihy/2011/40/texty/eng/18_lukacikova_eng.pdf
- McDougall W. (1908). *Social Psychology*. London: Methuen. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/introductiontoso020342mbp>
- Molm, L. D., Schaefer, D. R., & Collett, J. L. (2007). The value of reciprocity. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 70(2), 199-217.

- Olthof, T. (2012). Anticipated feelings of guilt and shame as predictors of early adolescents' antisocial and prosocial interpersonal behaviour. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 9:3, 371-388, DOI: 10.1080/17405629.2012.680300
- Parveen S. (1995). A study of the personality as a function of Pro-social Behaviour & Religiousity, in Hindu and Muslim Boys and Girls. Retrieved from <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/33096>
- Penner, L. A. (2002). Pro-social Personality Battery (PSB). Retrieved from <https://www.med.wayne.edu/fam/faculty/pdfs/30itemspbkey.pdf>
- Penner, L.A., Fritzsche, B.A., Craiger, J.P., & Freifeld, T.S. (1995). Measuring the prosocial personality. In J.N. Butcher & C.D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in Personality Assessment, Vol. 10* (pp. 147-163). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sage, L. D. & Kavussanu M. (2008). Goal orientations, motivational climate, and prosocial and antisocial behaviour in youth football: Exploring their temporal stability and reciprocal relationships, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 26:7, 717-732, DOI: 10.1080/02640410701769716
- Spivak, A. L., Lipsey, M. W., Farran, D. C., & Polanin, J. R. (2014). Title Registration for a Systematic Review: Instructional Strategies for Enhancing Prosocial Behavior in Children and Youth: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *The Campbell Collaboration*. www.campbellcollaboration.org
- Tsang, J. (2006). Brief Report Gratitude and Pro-social Behaviour: An Experimental Test of Gratitude, *Cognition and Emotion*, 20(1), 138-148. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/02699930500172341>
- Twenge J. M., Baumeister R. F., DeWall C. N., Ciarocco N. J., and Bartels J. M (2007). Social Exclusion Decreases Pro-social Behaviour, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(1), 56-66, Doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.56
- Verma S. (1997). Pro-social Behaviour Development in Relation to Family. Structure and Value of Parents. Retrieved from <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/30566>
- Weymans, V. (2010). *Psychological predictors for prosocial behavior. A large-scale survey in Flanders*. Retrieved from http://lib.ugent.be/fulltxt/RUG01/001/459/596/RUG01_001459596_2011_0001_AC.pdf